



ADDENDUM #1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RFP 2020-016

Effective:	Addendum posted March 13, 2020
Project:	RFP 2020-016 Quince Orchard Boulevard Roadway Reconstruction & Design of a Shared Use Path
Issued By:	Mark Kile, Project Manager Department of Public Works 800 Rabbitt Road Gaithersburg, Maryland 20878

This addendum (“Addendum”) is incorporated into and made part of the Request for Proposal (“Solicitation”). The purpose of this addendum is to publish the questions asked by bidders and the City’s answers thereto relative to the Solicitation. The City is not responsible for the content of the questions and has provided the most comprehensive answers based on the interpretation of the questions.

Q.1. What permits would be needed to perform soil borings per Task 3 of the RFP?

A: If the soil borings are within the City Right-Of-Way, the contractor would coordinate with the Project Manager for the locations. The contractor is to provide traffic control plans for approval and provide adequate traffic control for the applicable locations. If the soil boring is outside of the right of way, the City will reach out to the individual property owner and obtain permission to do so. The contractor will be responsible to restore and backfill any areas for the safety of the public.

Q.2. Will there be any requirements for tracing the existing electrical lighting branch circuits within the project area?

A: The contractor will be required to locate the existing lighting branch circuits in order to maintain the existing lighting and to find the connection to the Pepco transformer serving the lights or applicable power source connection.

Q.3. Are we to analyze the existing load on the lighting circuits to determine if there is any spare capacity for adding any new lighting fixtures?

A: The contractor is to use best practices in order to determine how to layout the new lighting required, while being able to maintain the existing lighting during construction.

Q.4. Does Pepco or the city own the existing light fixtures and branch circuits?

A: The City owns only the light poles. Pepco owns all underground wiring between the lights and the light connection to the source (transformer or as applicable) for Quince Orchard Boulevard and Rabbitt Road.

Q.5. Is it known where the existing circuits are fed from?

A: The City does not have record drawings to provide for this solicitation.

Q.6. Page 5, Section 4: Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions: 4.1.I Financial Wellness states: *This section of the Proposal shall include a letter of recommendation from a financial institution that attests whether the Offeror is financially responsible to provide the Services.*

We are often required to submit a Letter of Financial Resources on company letterhead signed by an authorized representative of our company that outlines the following information:

- Company XXX hereby certifies that we have the financial capacity and manpower resources necessary to complete the referenced project to the satisfaction of Agency XXX within the time limit specified.
- Company XXX certifies that we are a financially responsible firm, including no debarment or suspension actions. We have no tax liability and are in good standing with the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation.
- Furthermore, we certify that Agency XXX will be fully protected against errors and omissions which may occur during this contract. Company XXX has Professional Liability Insurance; Comprehensive General Liability, Comprehensive Automobile Liability, and Worker's Compensation Insurance, which meets the requirements of the RFP. Copies of our Insurance Certificates are contained in the following pages.

Would you consider allowing a letter which follows the guidelines outlined above to be submitted in lieu of a letter from a financial institution?

A: The offeror needs to follow the instructions in the solicitation.

Q.7. Should the independent Appraisal Review be included in fee proposal? If not, how will the appraisal review be handled? Who will set the Just Compensation?

A: For anticipated properties along the corridor, appraisal for potential impacts should be included as indicated in the solicitation. See Task 12, Right-Of-Way Services. The City will determine the just compensation. Anticipate an hourly rate to perform an appraisal for each property.

Q.8. Will the City be handling the Settlement process? Including deed prep and recording? Or should Settlement services be added to the fee proposal?

A: The City will handle the settlement process. Recording will be done by the City with associated fees for filing. The offeror to include Deed and Plat to be included for twelve (12) properties along Quince Orchard Boulevard and Rabbitt Road on the side of the proposed shared use path.

Q.9. To what extent will the selection be based on price?

A: The selection committee will evaluate all proposals based on price and other factors as indicated in the solicitation.

Q.10. In Subtask 1.9, it is noted that, "See subtask 1.8 for traffic count information to be utilized in the evaluation", however, Subtask 1.8 does not mention traffic data. Could you please clarify this.

A: See Q.46.

Q.11. In order to account for Direct Costs in the price proposal, where in the price proposal would the City prefer these costs to be shown?

A: Contractor to include direct costs to include on the pricing sheet. However, for each task, provide a direct cost and breakdown so that we can understand how you arrived at each number

Q.12. Please clarify what is intended by 'as-builts' for all utilities, etc. Is it intended that the 'Engineer Contractor' perform the survey and create the as-builts or the 'Construction Contractor' complete that data and provide to the 'Engineer Contractor' to prepare red-line as-builts to document any changes from the approved drawings?

A: The offeror is to include an as-built plan that is redlined for any construction changes. An amendment will remove the as-built survey component for Task 13.

Q.13. At the pre-submission meeting it was mentioned that flooding concerns would need to be evaluated on this project. Can the City provide more information on what level of analysis is expected?

A: Please disregard, after additional research there are no flooding concerns along the corridor. However, the offeror should review to confirm floodplain limits and requirements if there will be any impacts.

**Q.14. Page 7 Section J. References of Proposal Preparation:
Are the three requested references needed only for the Prime consultant only or are three required from all subconsultants as well?**

A: The prime contractor is the only entity that needs references to be submitted.

Q.15. Are there any weights related to the "Evaluation Criteria," particularly the Pricing?

A: See Q.9.

Q.16. Is there an MBE/DBE requirement for this RFP?

A: No.

Q.17. Are there any page limit restrictions for the solicitation?

A: No.

Q.18. Please clarify the End Limits of the project. Parts of the RFP refer to the shared use path extending along QOB to Firstfield Road NEAR MD 124 and AT MD 124. Does the upgraded LED lighting end at Firstfield Road or at MD 124?

A: The Lighting should be evaluated from the Northern Connection of Firstfield Road and Quince Orchard Boulevard continuing on Quince Orchard Boulevard to MD124.

Q.19. At the preproposal meeting, there was discussion about connection to Brown Station Elementary School and the Youth Center on Rabbitt Road. Would you please clarify any special conditions required for these 2 locations?

A: There are no special conditions for these locations. The path will remain consistent with the layout and will spur from Quince Orchard Boulevard to the Youth Center on Rabbitt Road.

Q.20. Please define the what level of transit coordination should be included in the proposal. Several bus stops, benches, shelters, and trash receptacles will be impacted.

A: The offeror should be familiar with MCDOT RideOn and the coordination effort it requires.

Q.21. Is there a particular light fixture that the City has used on other shared use paths?

A: The City will provide a list of standard light options after the solicitation is awarded.

Q.22. Please confirm that the signing and marking plans cover both the roadway (new crosswalks/all way stop need new signs and markings) and new shared use path.

A: A signing and marking plans should be include to confirm no conflicts between existing and proposed for the Shared Use Path.

Q.23. Is there a particular type/brand of bicycle repair station that the City has used?

A: The City would like to incorporate this into the design and would look for the consultant to provide recommendations.

Q.24. Normally for projects requiring Verizon relocation, Verizon's engineers do the actual relocation design and the agency's engineers would only perform coordination efforts with Verizon. Please confirm that Verizon does not intend to perform the design themselves and that the relocation design efforts should in fact be included in this proposal.

A: Please assume Verizon will provide the utility relocation design horizontal placement. The offeror should incorporate the necessary easement, metes and bounds description and a plan profile of the relocated line.

Q.25. Please verify the City's Reforestation on Public Lands Policy (page 30). We could not locate this document. This document was found on this City's website (<https://www.gaithersburgmd.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=5164>). Is this the valid reference?

A: Please utilize the City of Gaithersburg Tree Manual as posted online at the link.

Q.26. Pertaining to the review of the video inspection of the storm drain system, since this will not be provided until after the contract has been awarded, is there an estimated number of structures we should assume will need repair details?

A: Most of the inlet structures on the proposed Shared Use Path (Brown Station Elementary School) side will require the existing inlet structures to be converted or removed/replaced or modified, hence the consultant should be familiar with each of those. As to the structures that exist on the other side of Quince Orchard Boulevard, the storm drain structures within the reconstruction area should be evaluated.

Q.27. Task 1.7 design surveys notes waterways and wetland limits should be identified. Based upon preliminary assessment, no waterways/wetland limits were identified. Would the City confirm the presence of waterways or wetlands based on adjacent or previous projects?

A: The offeror should have the expertise to review the corridor and be able to determine if there are any wetlands or waterways that would be impacted with the proposed work.

Q.28. Subtask 1.9 references traffic count information in Subtask 1.8, which does not mention traffic counts. Please clarify if the proposal should traffic counts for both Subtasks 1.9 and 1.10?

A: See Q.46.

Q.29. Please provide additional detail for the anticipated efforts for Task 12: ROW Services?

A: Please refer to the solicitation for areas that the contractor should be familiar with and other associated clarifications in any addendum. If we need to acquire easements or right-of-way the consultant should be able to evaluate the corridor prior to bid and generally know how much effort this will require up to the point of turning it the City for discussions with the private property owners.

Q.30. The links for the checklists in Section 8.3 did not work (permitting services). Please provide the applicable link.

A: See Addendum #1

Q.31. What is the anticipated number of public outreach events?

A: See Q.54.

Q.32. Should preparation of a utility conflict matrix be included?

A: The offeror is responsible for best practices associated with tracking utility conflicts and making sure they are resolved in a clear and timely manner.

Q.33. Will the City provide a letter to the contractor outlining the project and providing a City contact name and phone number so that the contractor can present the letter when trying to obtain permission to obtain access to private property, as may be necessary?

A: The City will send notices to all adjacent properties.

Q.34. Does the City have a preference or non-preference for the type of ESD SWM infrastructure to be installed (e.g., tree boxes to replace trees removed, curb bump outs, bioretention)? If so, please identify the preferences.

A: The City would look for the consultant to work with the City's Stormwater Division during the design to meet ESD requirements.

Q.35. Please clarify if storm drain inlet inspections are to be part of the scope of work (1st paragraph page 24 of 42) because the 1st paragraph of page 25 of 42 states that video inspection of the storm drain features, including inlets, will be provided along with "recommendations for repair and/or replacement."

A: Storm Drain inlets should be inspected and included as part of the work effort. In addition, the City will provide additional video inspection records for review and incorporation into the plan documents.

Q.36. Are there known wetlands or Waters of the US in the vicinity of the project site for which permits will be needed?

A: The offeror should be knowledgeable about this portion of the permitting.

Q.37. Will permits be needed for the removal of the existing trees?

A: No permits necessary for removal of the existing trees.

Q.38. Are there pre-concept SWM Plans for the Park location or the ROW? If so, will the County please provide?

A: For the solicitation, there is no additional information.

Q.39. Would the City entertain adding a pre-concept design phase to the project to ensure that the layout of SWM features is in line with what the City, Park, and community/residents are in favor of?

A: We are looking for the offer to move forward with the design, but be able to provide the

expertise to incorporate SWM features into the preliminary design.

Q.40. Is there a font/spacing preference for the Proposal?

A: No, but should be easily readable.

Q.41. Is there a page limit to any of the sections to be submitted in the proposal?

A: No.

Q.42. Are there any MBE/DBE/SBR or VSBE goals attached to this project?

A: No.

Q.43. Do the references (RFP 7 of 42) have to be the ones completed only within last two years? Is it okay to show the projects ongoing or completed more than 2 years ago as the references if there are no such projects?

A: The completed projects should have the task/contract completed within the window indicated. The City understands the projects may have started before the two year window requested, however the project completions should be within the last two years.

Q.44. Will the City of Gaithersburg notify the owners of the adjacent properties and obtain permission for our surveyors to work on their private property?

A: The City will reach out to the adjacent property owners initially.

Q.45 Is the photometric analysis required for the street lighting design?

A: The consultant should provide a photometric analysis with their drawings.

Q.46 Subtask 1.9 describes “See subtask 1.8 for traffic count information to be utilized in the evaluation.”, however Subtask 1.8 is not related to traffic count information. Please provide the correct traffic information.

A: This reference will be removed. Traffic Count for the intersection is to be included in the scope of work.

Q.47 How should the crosswalks be evaluated? Do you have any specific study methodology that you want us to do?

A: We would look to have the consultants expertise support the City in this effort for this corridor.

Q.48. Will the existing speed cameras be relocated or removed during the construction?

A: For the solicitation purposes, we will assume removal of the existing speed cameras.

Q.49. What kind of bike repair facility and how many locations does the city expect in the

design?

A: Please see Q.23.

Q.50. Is the last bullet of Task 16 “Provide “As-built” attribute data for all storm drain and stormwater management features” a typographical error?

A: See amendment #1. Item was a typo and should be included in Task 15.

Q.51. Please clarify the project limits for the reconstruction and the shared use path on Rabbitt Road. Does the reconstruction and the shared-use path go up to the Public Works Garage Entrance or Youth Center on Rabbitt Road? The description in 8.1 A and the Exhibit B do not match.

A: The Shared Use Path will stop at the Youth Center in an appropriate manner.

Q.52. Will the city provide traffic accident records for the traffic analyses?

A: The consultant should be able to obtain the traffic records as needed from Montgomery County.

Q.53. Should the costs during and post construction be included in the pricing proposal?

A: There are costs for during and post construction indicated in the solicitation. Please see solicitation.

Q.54. How many times would the city like to have public outreach meetings throughout the duration of the contract?

A: Assume one, maximum four hours in length. If ultimately not included in contract, the City will reduce scope. No fees associated with rental of facility.

Q.55. Is this project funded by a Tap grant?

A: No.

Q.56. Do insurance and W-9 forms need to be submitted with our proposal?

A: No. This information will need to be provided before contract approval.

Q.57. Why is an arborist needed for the project?

A: Arborist is needed for the purpose of underground tree root impacts to the City infrastructure and to provide recommendations.

Q.58. Do the trees being removed need any permits?

A: The tree removal limits will be shown on the drawings for size and will be reviewed.

Q.59. Will a Maryland Department of Environment Joint Permit Application be required?

A: We are looking for the consultant to provide their expertise with this project to handle any required permits.

Q.60. Will the City pay for any permit fees?

A: The City will pay for any direct permit fee costs directly with a check. The consultant must provide fifteen business days for processing to the project manager and anticipate this into the proposed schedule, Then the check can be routed to the correct entity for processing.

Q.61. Will the plan require going to Planning Commission?

A: No, due to the work being in the Right-of-Way

~ END OF ADDENDUM~